

The following article, "Certain aspects of the Anti-Schwarz Campaign" is written by an Australian Educator and Journalist, Mr. W. H. C. Eddy. He is President of the Workers Educational Association and on the staff of the University of Sydney. His article refers to the Australian manifestations of the campaign of misrepresentation and slander which originated in the U.S.A. His discussion is most relevant to the situation in the U.S. as well as in other countries.

Aspects of THE ANTI-SCHWARTZ CAMPAIGN

W. H. C. Eddy

In my review of Dr. Fred Schwartz's book, "You Can Trust the Communists", I noted the existence of an anti-Schwartz campaign, and it is worth considering some of its features.

CENTURY

Century (July 20, 1962) printed an article under the heading, "Jesuits Challenge Anti-Comm. Tactics. U.S. Red-Baiters Under Fire". The bulk of the article is drawn, it claims, via the "Catholic Worker" from the Jesuit Weekly "America". Dr. Schwartz is dealt with alongside the Birchites as if they were all tarred with the same brush. This is an old technique familiar to students of Stalin's frame-ups in the thirties, students who were subjected to the kind of attacks then that Dr. Schwartz endures now, for saying what Mr. Khrushchev, twenty years later, admitted to be true.

On what Dr. Schwartz says, "America" (as quoted) has one direct comment and one only, namely—"Much of what Dr. Schwartz says is unquestionably and chillingly true". For the rest, it concentrates on things which it regards as "equally worthy of emphasis — actions, reforms and attitudes which we contend are terribly necessary and excruciatingly urgent if the war against

Communism is to be won; the end of injustice to the Negro; charity towards all men, and specially the poor; willingness to offer our lives and our treasures to our country in the defence of freedom; and the deep down courage it takes to do all this with unswerving determination month after month, year after year, in a struggle that can't be won with slogans or short-cuts".

Reading this, we could easily come to believe that Dr. Schwartz says or implies that the struggle can be won by slogans or short-cuts when, in fact, he says the opposite. The most self-damning aspect of the quotations given by *Century* is that Dr. Schwartz deals with every one of the points that they claim "are equally worthy of emphasis", and he says things about them that reveal far more consideration of their place in the struggle against Communism than is shown by his "critic", who simply reinforces popular illusions. Take as an example, the question of the American Negro.

It is a fact that American Negroes suffer disabilities of various kinds. It is also a fact that the Supreme Court of the United States and the Federal Government, as well as a host of reformers, negro and white, have laboured and

are labouring at this complex and difficult problem, the heritage of centuries. It is a problem which nobody can overcome merely by decree, by legislation or by judicial ruling; a problem of education, of changing customs and habitual attitudes. In grappling with that problem over recent decades, the United States Government has built up, by liberal standards, a record which any other government in the world might envy.

It is not *Century* but Schwartz who points out in this connection, that "in the formation of public opinion, it is not what you do that counts, but what people believe you do". President Eisenhower sent troops to Little Rock, Arkansas, a few years ago, to support the right of Negro children to attend mixed schools. Yet it was widely believed in Africa that the troops were sent to prevent them from doing so. The very effort to ensure justice has been misrepresented as if it were the infliction of injustice. A reform is worthwhile in itself, but it is not of the slightest value in the struggle against Communism unless its real nature is brought home to the people of the world—in fact, it will be exploited by the Communists against the society in which it occurs. There are few better examples than this white-negro problem in the United States. Few things have brought more discredit on the American Government in outside public opinion, and for few has it deserved more credit.

This is the kind of thing the jesuitical journal (as quoted) covers up by its way of handling the issue. Similar points might be made regarding every other assertion in its list. It systematically nourishes some of the chief illusions which Dr. Schwartz is at pains to expose and leaves the "innocent" reader with a radically wrong conception of what Schwartz says.

Century continues:

"Then follows this poem by the editor-in-chief of 'America', Father Thurston N. Davis, S.J. . . ."

The poem purports to be by an anti-Communist, who makes "little lists of folks I think are Communists"; it goes to absurd lengths and ends up with all listed but the writer—a crude satire, the effect of which is to ridicule all assertions of undercover Communist activity.

Once again it is not said that this is the kind

of thing that Dr. Schwartz does, but since it is otherwise pointless, the reader is simply left to conclude this for himself, yet we can read Dr. Schwartz's book from cover to cover, we can read his published speeches, and we shall not find any of this kind of activity. He is concerned with describing the Communist outlook and ways of working, its extraordinary successes and the problem of resisting it, which most people prefer comfortably to ignore.

Dr. Schwartz does, however, have something to say on the subject. He acknowledges that "it may be difficult indeed to establish the fact" that someone is an undercover Communist, he mentions one test which may give leads, and he takes it no further directly than that. In this I think he is right. The essential general understanding is the nature of the struggle being waged and of the methods being used.

At the same time it is absurd to pretend that freedom can survive while its main opponents organize and systematically infiltrate, discredit, hamper, even destroy as forces its main defenders, while the latter may not even discuss who the undercover Communists are. The vigilance upon which freedom depends involves calling things by their right names.

Anyone who does succeed in recognising an undercover Communist or two will find that he has a host of other similar allegations foisted onto him, some of them where he has merely raised a question, some of them where the thought may never even have crossed his mind. To get it established that all who name undercover Communists are irresponsible or worse, is one of the best protections infiltrators can have.

It is worth pausing a moment on the jesuitical journalist's praise of much of what Schwartz says as "unquestionably and chillingly true". In the very commendation there is a stab through the word, "chillingly". This is in line with the suggestion sometimes made that anyone who draws attention to the magnitude of the Communist problem is appealing to fear. It is the kind of thing that was said in the 1930's against those who pointed to the implications of the Nazi threat. They, it was said, were appealing to fear. Winston Churchill (who was one of them) met this with

typical forthrightness: pointing out that it was better to be afraid now than dead or slaves hereafter. It is certainly true that those who utter warnings are pointing to dangers. All such so-called appeals to fear are also appeals to courage and the nature of the response depends on the spirit of him who hears. The worst and most foolish fear is that which pretends that real dangers are non-existent. As for Schwartz's book, I find his square confrontation of the facts not chilling but warming, for along that path, and that path alone, lies the survival of freedom. "Courage is wisdom concerning danger."

SUNDAY MIRROR

If we turn to the *Sunday Mirror* of April 1, 1962, we find some other aspects of the anti-Schwartz campaign in a report of one of Dr. Schwartz's meetings in Sydney. We look first of all for the most important thing—namely, what Dr. Schwartz said to that meeting on the subject of Communism. We find that:

"His arguments were overpowering, his logic impeccable. . . . He was the complete master of his subject: Anti-Communism."

But of the substance of the overpowering arguments, of the subject of which he was complete master, of the concrete details of what he said to that meeting about Communism, the two columns say not a word. They are filled up in other ways.

"Dr. Schwartz is a triple-degreed (arts, science, medicine), full-blooded professional crusader, and Australia's answer, perhaps, to Dr. Billy Graham."

What on earth that last phrase means, I don't know. For some people it may cover up the fact that Graham is a supporter of Dr. Schwartz, and there is no sense in which the one can legitimately be described as an "answer" to the other.

The *Mirror* goes on:

"His fire-and-brimstone messages and evangelistic trappings have carried him into the top league in America. Some big names there hail him as a Messiah. Some other big names see him as the proprietor of a travelling circus."

This is all highly suggestive language and can easily be disposed of by reading what Dr. Schwartz has written and the rest of the *Mirror's* own article. If any "big names" hail Dr. Schwartz as a

Messiah, such nonsense gets no support from Schwartz's own writings. And if any other equally vague "big names" see him as the proprietor of a travelling circus, the idea gets no support from the *Mirror's* own report of his meeting.

About 200 people "dribbled in" and "sat expectantly". The meeting opened with the National Anthem, a clergyman said a prayer, a soprano sang a solo, Dr. Schwartz spoke—"he got a good hand at the end". A speaker was introduced, who gave information about the collection which was then taken. It is the pattern of thousands of meetings that occur all over Australia every week, and there is no circus about it.

The main line of the attack on Dr. Schwartz concerns the collection. "Dr. Fred C. Schwartz," the *Mirror* says, "is back in Sydney to sell anti-Communism to Australians." It hammers this theme.

"He sold it this week to the tune of religious songs and prayers, the National Anthem and a tinkling piano.

"He also sold it to the tune of 25 guineas for a life subscription, and two guineas for a year's subscription or whatever lesser offerings his audience could be persuaded to make."

And it returns to this theme at the end, repeating the figures and giving as its final sentence: "The purses clicked and the money rattled"—an echo of its heading: "Click Go The Purses".

It is easy to be carried away by the overtones of propaganda like this, but it is worth pausing to consider the substance of what is being said. Any cause which wants to spread information needs money. A well-established and honest way of raising money is to ask those who believe in the cause to give it. Religious bodies do it, anti-religious bodies do it, political parties do it, all sorts of organisations do it, and it is perfectly proper that they should. Many different organisations also employ full-time, one or more of those who believe in the cause for which they stand. Again, it is perfectly proper that they should, and it is no more discreditable to Dr. Schwartz or to his organisation that he should work for it full-time and be paid for it than it is discreditable to academics that they work at the academic calling

full-time and be paid for that.

THE BULLETIN

Peter Coleman wrote up the same meeting in *The Bulletin* of April 7, 1962:

"He is no great orator. The atmosphere was reminiscent of an adult education class."

And according to Coleman the collection was £36, not enough to cover the cost of the meeting. So much for the circus and the suggestions of rolling in great sums of money, though it would have been perfectly proper and a reason for satisfaction had the sum been far greater. Coleman's article, I might add, is by no means pro-Schwartz.

All the irrelevant propaganda in the *Mirror* fills up space that could have been used to report the substance of what Schwartz said, but at that the *Mirror* stopped short. It quoted a snippet of what Schwartz allegedly had said in San Francisco. It gave what Schwartz was allegedly telling businessmen on unspecified occasions in Australia. But on what he said on Communism at that meeting where its reporter was present to report directly, it preserved a complete silence—a silence which cried aloud.

THE SUN-HERALD

The *Sun-Herald* of April 8, 1962, ran a full-page article on "*There's a Red-Baiting Boom in the U.S.*" This was based on an article in *Look*, March 13, 1962 ("*Rightist Revival: 'Who's on the Far Right?'*" by Fletcher Knebel). Both these articles are at a higher level than the two others we have considered. Their worst injustice is in bracketing Schwartz and his movement with some of the crackpot or worse groups of the U.S. far right, but Knebel at least explains his reasons for doing so, and the *Sun-Herald* repeats some of his main assertions and adds a reported comment from Dr. Schwartz himself.

Knebel notes the greatly increased revenues of Dr. Schwartz's movement, but he also notes that of these, Schwartz draws only his salary (one which, incidentally, is less than he earned in his profession) and that the bulk of the funds are used on schools, staff salaries, upkeep of an

American headquarters, a newspaper in India, a headquarters in Japan and one in Australia, and all the expenses inseparable from such a movement. Part of its income, incidentally, comes from the royalties on Dr. Schwartz's writings, all of which go to the movement.

He notes that "Dr. Schwartz considers it unfair and, in some contexts, libellous, to bracket his message with that of the Right Wing." And Knebel concedes:

"It is true that very little of what Dr. Schwartz utters could be classified as Right Wing. Why then is he mentioned in this article? Because this writer is convinced, after more than a hundred interviews on the ramparts of the Right, that the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade is by far the most important single factor in the Rightist revival. . . . Starting with basically sound Schwartz material, many 'students' go on to find Communists in the White House. . . ." etc., etc.

There it is again, from an opponent—"basically sound Schwartz material"; it is reminiscent of "unquestionably and chillingly true", "complete master of his subject", "arguments . . . overpowering", "logic impeccable". But Knebel goes on just like the others:

"Dr. Schwartz says his mission is to 'educate' and declares he has no answers. It is for others, he says, to find methods to halt the Communist menace." So he leaves a vacuum into which the "missionaries of the far Right promptly pour".

Schwartz, according to Knebel, urges that Churches should guide the study groups to keep extremists from getting control. But he "resolutely refuses to criticise Rightist groups. He has declared that it is "guilt by association" to include his group with Right wing organizations "if, by 'Right wing', they mean tending toward a fascist group with central direction by a leader and unrestrained big business with elimination of all government controls". That, he said, "we do not advocate". He refused, Knebel says, to identify the Right wing groups to which he referred.

One would imagine that Schwartz has sufficiently indicated the kind of programme from which he

distinguishes himself. The curious themselves have only to scan the various rightist groups to identify those the label fits. Moreover, with the Press throughout the English-speaking world attacking the Right extremists in the U.S.A. so that their weaknesses are exposed over and over again, it would be the height of folly for Schwartz to join in the hunt. It seems clear enough that Schwartz is not being deflected from his main concern, namely Communism, to squander his movements energies in conflicts with other forces. There is no serious danger that the Birchites will conquer the world. It would be just too naive for Schwartz to be deflected into dealing with them. There are abundant hands for that job.

I don't know where Knebel got his information that "Dr. Schwartz declares he has no answers". If he means he has no short cuts—then that is right enough because there are no short cuts. But the last chapter of Schwartz's book is entitled, "Programme for Survival", and deals precisely with that.

The *Sun-Herald* reports some of Schwartz's own alleged comments on some of these issues:

" 'I have repeatedly defied anyone to provide evidence from my writings or speeches that identifies me with the extreme Right. . . . It is perfectly true that belligerent groups sometimes move in the wake of the crusade, but that's not my fault. All

I do is tell the truth, and the truth is always dangerous. If you tell a fellow his house is on fire, he may have a heart attack or jump out the window and be killed. But are you going to refuse to tell him the truth for this reason?' "

We may add that this is particularly the case after a period of public evasion of a major issue, especially where the question concerns the operations of a totalitarian organisation, so different from so much that we take for granted. An awakening to what is going on is bound to be piecemeal, bound to produce some panic, some wild re-actions and extremism, bound also to be exploited for various extraneous purposes of which some will be discreditable. The Communists are expert at picking on the instances of irresponsibility or exploitation, and at smearing all anti-Communism activity by means of them. But it is

folly for those who don't want a Communist regime to do their job for them.

Many intellectuals do not go along with Dr. Schwartz's Christianity, and they join issue on a secularist basis. They will find that he has anticipated them:

"Organisational unity is a mirage. The great need is multiplicity, not unity. The unity of a free society resides in its diversity. Movements must be formed which conserve the motivating forces within each group and channel them into the struggle for freedom and survival."

In short, Schwartz is directing their attention to the issue which dominates all others for the survival of Western intellectual and liberal traditions, religious and secular alike, but he is not stampeded into claiming that all other differences must be sunk in the face of it; on the contrary. In this, I think that he is being both principled and statesmanlike, and that his emphasis on diversity is right. So is his emphasis on facing up to the issue posed by Communism. Secularists, by and large, are running away from them. That is not necessarily an indictment of the secularist intellectual position itself, but it is an indication of a hardening of their theoretical arteries. They are no longer thinking of the nature of the operations of living forces, but are re-acting merely to labels.

The *Sun-Herald* reports that analysts blame sundry things for the "Rightist revival" in U.S.A. As we might expect, the most important factor is left out. Knebel himself, however, in a curiously distorted way and, apparently without recognising the full import of what he is saying, gives the main explanation of the rise of the American Rightist groups. When he concedes that Schwartz material is basically sound, that can mean only that this material is stating central relevant facts about Communism. When he also claims that Schwartz's movement is "by far the most important single factor in the Rightist revival", though not itself part of it, we have our explanation of these events.

The greatest single factor is the realisation of central relevant facts about Communism. In some people such realisation produces panic and foolish extremes; for others it gives a chance to

exploit anti-Communism for other purposes, just as during World War II, all sorts of causes exploited the then prevalent anti-Nazism. It is no remedy for panic to try to smother up the information which gives rise to it. The only remedy and the only enduring way to drain the vitality from the crackpot or exploiting movements is to face the issues and to reinforce those who are facing them sanely; and of these, on Knebel's own showing, Schwartz is one.

It is worthwhile reviewing these various attacks on Schwartz to see them in perspective.

The jesuitical journal, as reported, reinforces popular illusions about ways of struggling against Communism without revealing that Schwartz deals with each one of them and shows that, however desirable they may be in themselves, they are not sufficient. It also holds up to ridicule any attempt to perceive undercover Communist activity, an attitude which serves it directly. In its very praise of Schwartz, it discourages readers by suggesting that his work is "chilling", which it is only to those who prefer blindness to sight. The *Mirror*, apart from sundry insinuations easily refuted, concentrates its main attack on the raising of funds essential for the struggle against Communism.

Knebel brackets Schwartz with the Right extremists because they exploit his work, and he attacks Schwartz because the latter will not be deflected from dealing with the Communists to attacking others, which would certainly suit the communists perfectly.

In each single case, the attack directly serves the Communist cause about which the attacks, in various ways, indicate that Schwartz is right. That does not necessarily mean that those responsible are deliberate agents of Communism any more than Neville Chamberlain and his kind were agents of Nazism. But it is not surprising if those whose eyes have been suddenly opened to the kind of menace they confront, leap to the conclusion that such people are Communists. A large part of the misjudgments of those who see Communists under every bed is due to the monstrous follies of those who walk around in a world of dreams in which no major internal problem of Communism exists, who refuse to face up to the implications of the Communists' determina-

tion to conquer the world, or of their methods of going about it. Of course, such people are not Communists, but if they want to know why they are misjudged they should look for the explanation in themselves first of all. It is their recklessness and wilful blindness which is chilling to anyone who cares about truth or liberty or justice in human society.

Those who are attacking Schwartz in the ways I have indicated are primarily protecting illusions. It is the business of education to expose illusions.

When parts of our society fall short of their own professed standards, criticism is essential if they are to maintain their vitality. When those who disagree with the ideas basic to parts of our social life say so plainly, no liberal is entitled to object provided that what is freely attacked can also be freely defended. When Dr. Schwartz states plainly and tellingly central facts about what Communism is doing in the world today and about the position into which it has driven free societies, anyone doing justice to his case as he states it, is entitled to argue as vigorously as he pleases that Schwartz is wrong. But when, for whatever reasons, Schwartz is attacked by people who evade the issues by admitting in general terms that he is substantially right, but who go on to seek to discredit him by insinuation, by association and by sundry other forms of the baser types of propaganda, then those who believe in freedom have a clear duty to come to his defence and to expose the real nature of the attack. He is fighting their fight, and what he says is getting home, and he is being attacked for that reason. It is elementary loyalty and solidarity to speak out on his behalf and to expose the shoddy propaganda tricks that are being used against him.

* * * * *

Printed by Christian Anti-Communism Crusade
P. O. BOX 890
LONG BEACH 1, CALIFORNIA